

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

| <i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i> | <i>Potentially Significant Impact</i> | <i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i> | <i>Less Than Significant Impact</i> | <i>No Impact</i> |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| CULTURAL RESOURCES—Would the proposed project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SETTING

PROPOSED PROJECT

Many of the original surveys of archaeological sites in the Bay region were conducted between 1906 and 1908 by N.C. Nelson, which yielded the initial documentation of nearly 425 “earth mounds and shell heaps” along the littoral zone of the Bay (Nelson 1907). From these beginnings, the most notable sites in the Bay region were excavated scientifically, including the Emeryville shellmound (Ala-309), the Ellis Landing Site (Cco-295) in Richmond, and the Fernandez Site (CC0-259) in Rodeo Valley (Morrato 1984). These dense midden sites, such as Ala-309, have been carbon 14 dated to be 2310 ± 220 years old, although other evidence from around the Bay suggests that human occupation in the region is of greater antiquity, ± 5000 B.C. (Davis & Treganza 1959). Many of the earliest sites suggested less emphasis on shellfish than the later middens, but were rather focused on hunting and vegetal food processing. The natural marshland biotic communities along the edges of bays and channels were the principal source for subsistence and other activities during the prehistory of the San Francisco Bay region.

Prehistorically, the Islais Creek flowed east from Twin Peaks, which maintained a 3,000 acre marsh that was tidally influenced through Islais Creek Cove. Potrero Point was located at the northern waters of Islais Creek Cove. The rich natural resources of the area would have been an attractive locale for food procurement to prehistoric cultures.

Having undergone significant landscape change from the prehistoric and protohistoric periods, this area has served as the center for many of the earliest manufacturing development in the Southern Waterfront area, which included a gun powder plant and the San Francisco Cordage Manufactory. By 1867, the Islais Creek Cove and marshlands were bridged by a trestle that

spanned from Potrero Point to the 3rd Street shoreline near Innes Avenue (Hupman and Chavez 2001). The trestle was used to convey the Potrero and Bay View Railroad. With the inclusion of the railroad to the southern portion of San Francisco, in 1871 the City passed an ordinance to move the slaughterhouses from the populated areas of the City to the southeastern part of town, to the east side of the 3rd Street trestle between present-day Cargo Way and Burke Avenue (Hupman and Chavez 2001). The area remained on the marginalized fringes of the city, essentially a dumping ground for the butchers, who allowed their waste to fall into the mud flats below to be washed into the Bay.

By the turn of the 20th Century, growing sentiment within the San Francisco business establishment to redevelop the Islais Creek marshlands into a channelized, navigable port for commerce led to the creation of the Islais Creek Reclamation District in 1925, which included 280-acres west of 3rd Street and 8-acres for the Islais Creek Channel (Dow 1979 as cited in Hupman and Chavez 1995). A 2,000 foot long rock seawall was erected in the Islais Creek Cove, west of 3rd Street, creating the Islais Creek Channel. The mud removed during dredging of Islais Creek, along with local aggregate and rock, was used to fill the Islais Creek Cove and marshlands (Hupman and Chavez 2001). The reclamation was tentatively complete in 1936, although many areas still remained unimproved.

With the establishment of the Islais Creek Channel, numerous wharves and piers were built to the north and south of the channel. Additional piers and industrial plants were added along the channel as the reclamation of the marshlands improved. In addition, the I-280 overpass, which crosses the Islais Creek Channel, was completed in 1967 (Hupman and Chavez 2001).

ALTERNATIVE 1

The project setting for Alternative 1 is the same as under the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 2

The project setting for Alternative 2 is the same as under the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 3

The project setting for Alternative 3 is the same as under the proposed project.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The setting for the No Project Alternative is the same as current conditions since construction of a 2.5 mile cable project would not occur.

REGULATORY CONTEXT

Based on section 15064.5 and Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*, a project would have significant adverse impacts to cultural resources if the project would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Section 15064.5 provides that, in general, a resource not listed on state or local registers of historical resources shall be considered by the Lead Agency to be historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical resources. This section also provides standards for determining what constitutes a “substantial adverse change” that must be considered a significant impact on archaeological or historic resources.

According to the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5(a)(3)), generally a resource shall be considered “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (Public Resources Code SS5024.1 Title CCR, Section 4852). When a project will impact an archeological site, it needs to be determined whether the site is a historical resource, which is defined as any site which:

- (a) Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and
- (b) Meets any of the following criteria:
 - 1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - 2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - 4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition, a resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined by Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant.

CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact “unique archaeological resources.” Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that ‘unique archaeological resource’ means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it

can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.”

IMPACTS DISCUSSION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

To determine the significance of the impacts anticipated from the proposed project, the project's effects were evaluated as provided under the revised CEQA guidelines. These guidelines are summarized in the checklist provided at the beginning of this section.

Methods

The potential for encountering subsurface archaeological resources in the project area was established by literature review of previously conducted reports and previously recorded archaeological sites. In order to augment the archival research conducted by Essex (2003), a records search of all pertinent survey and site data was conducted at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, California (File # 03-1052). The records were accessed by utilizing the San Francisco South, North and Hunters Point USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps, Township 2S, Range 5W. The review followed the proposed route along with a quarter-mile buffer. This buffer zone encompasses the alternative routes. Previous surveys and studies and archaeological site records were accessed as they pertained to the project area. Records were also accessed and reviewed in the Directory of Properties in the *Historic Property Data File for San Francisco County* for information on sites of recognized historical significance within the *National Register of Historic Places*, the *California Register of Historic Resources*, the *California Inventory of Historic Resources* (1976), the *California Historical Landmarks* (1996), and the *California Points of Historical Interest* (1992).

Native American Consultation

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted on June 15, 2004 in order to request a database search for sacred lands or other cultural properties of significance to local Native Americans. The sacred lands survey failed to indicate the presence of cultural resources in the project area. The NAHC provided a list of Native American contacts who may have further knowledge of the project area with respect to cultural resources and potential impacts to those resources that could occur as a result of the proposed project. Each person or organization listed

**TABLE 2.5-1
RELEVANT RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES IN PROJECT AREA**

| Designation | Location | Description | Comments | Reference |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------|
| P-38-4313 | 2325 3rd St. | American Can Company | Found eligible for NRHP, Criterion A | Stock 2003 |
| P-38-4276 | 1000 Evans Ave. | Hunters Point Power Station | Found ineligible for NRHP | Kelly 2002 |
| CA-SFr-15 | | Nelson Site No. 389a | Early recordation of shell heap; exact location is uncertain | Nelson 1910 |

SOURCE: On File at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.

on the NAHC list was contacted by letter requesting information about locations of importance to Native Americans. No response has been received as of the writing of this document.

The Muwekma Ohlone Park, located on the north shore of Islais Creek, near Pier 80, retains significance as a small open space representing the early Islais Creek environment. Although evidently not registered as a sacred land, this park may possess cultural significance.

PROPOSED PROJECT

During the prehistoric period, the majority of the project area, including the alternative routes, was submerged beneath the Islais and Precita Creek marshlands and the Islais Creek Cove. As a consequence, very few archaeological sites have been recorded in this area. The only prehistoric site recorded within a quarter-mile of the alignments is **CA-SFr-15**, a Nelson shellmound site recorded in 1909. At the time of its recordation, the site was disintegrated and subsequent work in the area has revealed that the site may be located on Ingalls Street, rather than on the edge of the former Islais Creek marshlands near Jerrold Avenue as it is currently mapped at the Information Center (Olmsted et al 1982). However, in terms of proximity to the last known location of this site, the proposed route is closest, at a quarter-mile southwest, to **CA-SFr-15**.

No direct impacts to known cultural resources would occur during construction of the project. Cultural resources, however, particularly archaeological resources, have unknown subsurface dimensions. Given the proximity of the project to the mouth of a fresh water source, Islais Creek, and the known prehistoric shell midden, **CA-SFr-15**, there exists the potential for buried prehistoric cultural resources. In addition, portions of the trenching would pass through historical fill that is likely to be greater than 50 years of age, qualifying the contents of the fill as potential cultural resources. Underground trenching could damage or destroy unknown cultural resources if

encountered, resulting in a potentially significant impact. The mitigation measures listed below would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CR-1: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (f), “provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction” should be instituted. Therefore, in the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and the Proponent shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives of the proponent and the qualified archaeologist would meet to determine the appropriate course of action. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.

Mitigation Measure CR-2: The project proponent shall notify a qualified paleontologist of unanticipated discoveries, made by either the cultural resources monitor or construction personnel and subsequently document the discovery as needed. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of a breas, or seeps of natural petroleum that trapped extinct animals and preserved and fossilized their remains, and/or trace fossil during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find.

No human burials have been discovered within 1 mile of the project route, and no discoveries of human remains are anticipated as a result of the project. However, if unanticipated human remains are uncovered during construction, the measure described below would ensure that the impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CR-3: In the event of the discovery of human remains, CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (e)(1) shall be followed, which is as follows:

- (1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:**
 - (A) The Coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and**
 - (B) If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:**
 - 1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.**
 - 2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.**

3. **The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.**

Historic Resources

The project route intersects the Hunters Point Power Plant (P-38-004276) at approximately milepost (MP) 2.4. The site was determined ineligible for listing on the CRHR (Kelley, 2002), and does not qualify as a cultural resource under CEQA. In addition, the power plant structure would not be affected during project construction.

The American Can Company (P-38-004313), a complex of buildings in the block between 20th, 22nd, 3rd and Illinois Streets, is directly adjacent to the project routes. Built around 1919, this complex represents the burgeoning canning industry and labor movements of the early 20th century in California. Therefore, Stock (2003) recorded the complex as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. However, given the underground nature of the proposed project in established roadways, the Can Company buildings would not be materially altered.

Numerous additional historical buildings and structures have been recorded within the Southern Waterfront area of San Francisco, many of which have been found eligible as either Districts (e.g. Dogpatch Historic District) or individually for the National Register or in local historical listings. The proposed project consists of underground cable installation in established roads—no alteration of the setting or directly to extant buildings is required; consequently, no substantial adverse change to an historical resource is expected to occur.

Archaeological test auguring was conducted on Third Street near 23rd Street by Wirth and Associates (1979). The testing found that the location is graded approximately 13 feet above city datum, composed of sandy fill below the concrete. Therefore, it is unlikely any impacts to cultural resource would occur at this location at a depth of 0 to 12 feet below surface. This does not preclude the possible existence of subsurface historical artifacts in the area.

ALTERNATIVE 1

Given the relative proximity of Alternative 1 to the proposed project route, the results discussed above would apply. No recorded cultural resource sites occur within the footprint of Alternative 1. However, Alternative 1 proposes to install cable along Illinois Street north of Islais Creek, directly adjacent to the Muwekma Ohlone Park, a potential traditional cultural place. No other Alternative would install cable within a quarter-mile of the Park. However, given the underground nature of the proposed cable installation within Illinois Street, it would not materially alter the park.

Therefore, the potential for impacts to cultural resources would be similar to those posed by the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 2

Given the relative proximity of Alternative 2 to the proposed project route, the results discussed above would apply. No recorded cultural resource sites occur within the footprint of Alternative 2. The potential for impacts to cultural resources would be tantamount to those posed by the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 3

Given the relative proximity of Alternative 3 to the proposed project route, the results discussed above would apply. No recorded cultural resource sites occur within the footprint of Alternative 3. The potential for impacts to cultural resources would be similar to those posed by the proposed project.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative would avoid all potential impacts related to archaeological resources associated with the proposed project.

CHECKLIST IMPACT CONCLUSIONS

- a) No listed National or State Historic Register properties were found during the course of the archival search for the proposed routes. A number of archaeological and architectural surveys have been conducted in the project area that has not identified significant prehistoric cultural resources in the area (Hupman and Hupman and Chavez 2001, 1995, 1993). The proposed cable routes would not impact any known sites; however, it is tenable that unrecorded sites and/or isolated artifacts do exist within the project area. The potential for encountering and disturbing known or unknown cultural resources would be minimized to a less than significant level with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure CR-1**.
- b) See item a).
- c) A records search of available paleontological site information was requested by Essex (2003) covering the project area from the Museum of Paleontology, University of California at Berkeley. The project transects an area that is primarily underlain by artificial fill materials. Undifferentiated pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock occur beneath the Potrero and Hunters Point switchyards and small areas in the western section of the project site (Geomatrix, 2003). The record search at the University of California, Museum of Paleontology did not identify any known fossil localities in the project area or its vicinity (Holroyd, 2003 as cited in Essex 2003).

Significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas designated as having low potential, and may result from the excavation activities related to the proposed project. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of **Mitigation Measure CR-2**.

- d). The presence of human remains have not been recorded in the project vicinity; however, the subsurface excavation required for construction of the proposed project could potentially disturb or destroy human remains from both prehistoric and historic time periods, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. This is considered a potentially significant impact that would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of **Mitigation Measure CR-3**.

REFERENCES – Cultural Resources

- Davis, J. T. & A. E. Treganza 1959. The Patterson Mound: A Comparative Analysis of the Archaeology of Site Ala-328. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 47: 1-92.
- Hupman, J.M., and D. Chavez 1993. Cultural Resources Investigation for the Bayside Phase II Discharge Alternatives EIR, San Francisco, CA. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.
- _____. 1995. Archaeological Resources Investigations for the Waterfront Plan EIR, San Francisco, CA. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University. [16882]
- _____. 2001. Archaeological Resources Review and Management Plan for the Muni Third Street Light Rail Project. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA. [File 25044].
- _____. 2003. Archaeological Resources Investigations for the Bayview-Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, San Francisco, CA. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University. [25045]
- Geomatrix. 2003. Quaternary Geology and Site Location, Potrero to Hunters Point 115 kV Underground Cable Project, San Francisco, California.
- Moratto, M.J. 1984. California Archaeology. Smithsonian Press: San Diego, CA.
- Nelson, N.C. 1907. San Francisco Bay Mounds. University of California Archaeological Survey Manuscripts: 349.
- Olmsted, R.R., N.Olmsted, D. Fredrickson and V. Bente 1982. San Francisco Bayside, Historical Cultural Resources Survey. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA. [File 6157].
- Stock, J. R. 2003. DPR Primary Record, P-38-004313. On File at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.
- Wirth Associates, Inc. 1979. *Potrero* 7 Phase II: Archaeological Test Excavations. Prepared for Pacific Gas & Electric. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.